



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named
Inventor : Steven Bathiche et al.

Appln. No.: 09/251,519

Filed : February 17, 1999

For : TWO-HANDED COMPUTER INPUT
DEVICE WITH ORIENTATION
SENSOR

Docket No.: M61.12-0101

Group Art Unit: 2675

Examiner: S. Kumar

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2002

Technology Center 2800

RESPONSE

Box Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING
SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST CLASS, TO THE
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231, THIS

22nd DAY OF November 2002
Joseph P. Kelly
PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 11, 2002.

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 11, 2002. Claims 1-20, 22 and 23 were pending and all claims were rejected. With this response, all claims remain unchanged.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all pending claims, namely, claims 1-20, 22 and 23, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,304) in view of Willner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,906).

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), the examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusions of obviousness. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in instances where multiple references are cited in combination, the examiner must show: 1) that a suggestion or motivation exists for combining the references, and 2) that the combined references teach or suggest